

REMARKS

This patent application presently includes Claims 5-12, all of which stand rejected. The claims are amended to define the applicant's invention more clearly, and all rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 5 and 9 were rejected as anticipated by Fujiwara et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,225,736. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Fujiwara does not teach or suggest in the present invention.

The present invention provides an element which corrects misconversions on a CRT screen which arises when the screen is planarized or flattened. This correcting element is made of a magnetic material, and is itself not a magnet. In the preferred embodiment, the misconception correcting element is made of iron and, like other magnetic materials, does not itself exhibit the magnetic polarity of a magnetic, but may be magnetized when placed in a magnetic field. Preferably, the correcting element is in the form of a pair of iron pieces which are provided on either side of the neck portion of the CRT portion of the CRT.

Unlike the present invention, Fujiwara has nothing to do with compensating misconversions of a CRT. Instead, it deals with reducing the distortion of the point of light produced by an electron beam. The examiner asserts that the elements indicated 264a and 264b are "magnetic compensating means," but they are not. Fujiwara describes them as "permanent magnetic members" (see Column 15, Line 6). Claim 5 recites a compensating element made of a magnetic material and Claim 9 recites a pair of bands made of a magnetic substance. These magnetic components have the property of compensating

the misconversions of the CRT. Those skilled in the art understand that a magnetic material or substance exhibits the property that it can be magnetized when placed in a magnetic field and that a permanent magnetic is not itself such a component. Moreover, the permanent magnetic in Fujiwara serve an entirely different purpose, and there is not the slightest suggestion that they could be of any benefit in reducing misconversions as the CRT screen is planarized. Accordingly, Fujiwara does not teach or suggest the present invention and Claims 5 and 9 are patentable thereover.

Claims 6, 7, 10 and 11 were rejected as obvious over Fujiwara in view of Rasmussen et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,008,577. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Neither Fujiwara, or Rasmussen, or the combination thereof renders these claims obvious.

Rasmussen discloses that magnetic material be added around and in the vicinity of the screen on CRT to improve contrast and brightness of the display by having an effect on the projectories of the electron beams. However, Rasmussen discloses nothing about using any such materials on the neck of the CRT, nor does it even remotely suggest that misconvergence can be corrected. Accordingly, Rasmussen adds nothing to Fujiwara that would be of any relevance to the present invention. Accordingly, neither of these references or the combination would teach or suggest the subject matter of Claims 5 or 9. Claims 5 and 9 are therefore allowable for the same reasons as stated above. The remaining claims depend from either Claim 5 or Claim 9 and are believed to be allowable based upon their dependence from an allowable claim.


Claims 8 and 12 were rejected as obvious over Fujiwara in view of Rasmussen and further in view of Shin, U.S. Patent No. 5,150,003. This rejection is respectfully

traversed. None of these references, or any combination thereof render the present claims obvious.

The examiner cites Shin for its disclosure of using adherence. However, he provides no explanation of how he proposes to overcome the deficiencies of Fujiwara and Rasmussen as references. Accordingly, the present rejection must fail for the same reasons stated above. Claims 8 and 12 should be allowed.

Applicant's attorney has made every effort to place this patent application in condition for allowance. It is therefore earnestly requested that the application, as a whole, receive favorable reconsideration and that all of the claims be allowed as presently constituted. Should there remain any unanswered questions, the examiner is requested to call the applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number given below.

Respectfully submitted,


Joseph B. Lerch
Reg. No. 26,936
Attorney For Applicant(s)

DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. BOX 5257
New York, NY 10150-5257
(212) 527-7700